

Additional information / Clarification submitted by the petitioner

Subject: Clarification of the systemic rule-of-law and EU-level security implications of the petition

The petitioner submits the present additional clarification in order to ensure that the true legal nature and consequences of the petition are assessed in their full systemic and EU-level context.

While the administrative summary prepared for the petition correctly records certain factual elements, it does not sufficiently reflect that the petition does not concern an individual labour dispute, but rather reveals a systemic, Member State-level failure affecting the EU legal order and the European Union's common security policy.

1. The public-interest disclosure and its legal significance

The starting point of the proceedings was not an individual grievance, but a public-interest whistleblower disclosure concerning risks falling within the responsibility of the State, including diplomatic and security-related vulnerabilities. The particular gravity of the case lies in the fact that State authorities responded to such a disclosure not with lawful correction, but with mechanisms of concealment and retaliation, thereby elevating the matter to a systemic pattern of serious legal violations.

The disclosure concerned operational and security vulnerabilities at a Hungarian diplomatic mission located in a post-Soviet, geopolitically sensitive region, an environment of particular relevance to the European Union's Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP). The subject matter of the disclosure was therefore not an internal administrative or employment issue, but a matter directly affecting the protection of EU interests in a high-risk external environment.

2. Institutional concealment and retaliation as a State practice

The public-interest disclosure was not followed by an independent, effective and transparent investigation. Instead, the petitioner was subjected to intimidating and silencing responses, objectively capable of deterring further disclosures. The absence of investigation and the retaliatory reaction cannot be regarded as isolated acts, but rather as a deliberate State practice, emptying Directive (EU) 2019/1937 of its practical effect in precisely those cases where whistleblower protection is most critical.

3. Systemic failure of judicial control

After exhausting internal channels, the petitioner sought judicial protection. However, the Hungarian courts failed to apply mandatory labour-law and procedural safeguards, and instead accepted internal executive practices lacking a statutory basis as lawful. This

judicial approach constitutes ex post legitimisation of unlawful executive conduct, effectively depriving the petitioner of the right to an effective remedy guaranteed by Article 47 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union.

It is also relevant that the same factual background led to the initiation of a criminal investigation in Hungary concerning the suspected persecution of a public-interest whistleblower, in which the petitioner was heard as a witness. The existence of criminal proceedings alone confirms that the matter cannot be characterised as an individual labour dispute, but raises issues of public interest, State responsibility and security relevance. During the proceedings, the petitioner requested the extension of the investigation to cover further serious offences, including budgetary fraud and the offence of treason under Hungarian criminal law, in light of the disclosed diplomatic-security vulnerabilities. Apart from the petitioner, no other identified or named persons were heard, and the investigation was closed without substantive investigative action, reinforcing the systemic nature of the failure identified in the petition.

4. EU legal basis and EU-level consequences

Where a Member State conceals serious vulnerabilities affecting a diplomatic mission operating in a geopolitically sensitive post-Soviet region, and retaliates against a whistleblower instead of addressing the risks, this directly weakens the effectiveness and credibility of the European Union's Common Foreign and Security Policy. The case simultaneously affects fundamental rights, the functioning of justice and the right to an effective remedy, constitutional and rule-of-law frameworks, and the responsibility of EU institutions to safeguard the Union's legal order.

5. Request to the European Parliament

The petitioner therefore respectfully requests that the European Parliament assess the case not as an individual labour dispute, but as a systemic rule-of-law and EU-level security matter affecting the Union as a whole, and examine whether the identified State practices are compatible with EU law and the Union's fundamental values.

Budapest, 30. January 2026.

Sincerely,

Pál Kemény
Petitioner